

REMARKS

In the present application, claims 16-24 and 29-53 are pending. Claims 16-17, 19-24, and 29-53 are rejected, and claim 18 is objected to in the present Office Action. In the present response, Applicants are amending claims 16-24, 29-34, 46, and 48-52 to better distinguish the claims of the present invention, and canceling claims 42-44. No new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Rejection under 35 USC §102(e)

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16-17, 19-24, and 29-53 under 35 USC §102(e) as being unpatentable over Powell, III (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,194, hereinafter *Powell*). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 16 recites “determining two block values for each block, which block values are representative of the values of the texels in the block...” According to Examiner’s arguments, *Powell* teaches a (single) quantization index (QIndex) that is associated with a block, the QIndex being an index into a table of QFactors which are used to quantize coefficients in the block. In contrast to the QIndex disclosed in *Powell*, the present invention determines two block values for a block and associates one of the block values to each of the texels in the block. *Powell* does not teach associating a Qindex value or coefficient with each texel in a block to compress a texture map for the block.

A close reading of *Powell* indicates that the compression method disclosed therein is fundamentally different from the compression method disclosed in the present invention. The portion of *Powell* referred to by the Examiner merely discusses primitive rendering within a tiler including calculating differentials for color, depth, edges, and texture coordinate interpolation across the surface of a triangle and determining pixel color and alpha data for polygons being rendered. There is no discussion in *Powell* of determining two block values for a block.

Additionally, Applicants find no discussion of “assigning to each texel one of the two block values associated with the block” in the section referred to by the Examiner (col. 22, line 36 to col. 25, line 30). If Examiner disagrees, Applicants would like the Examiner to clarify by specifically pointing out the sections and presenting reasons as to why these sections of *Powell* anticipate claim 16.

According to one example of the present invention (referring to Figure 4), a 4x4 pixel block comprises four color values (w, x, y, and z), which are reduced to two color values (a, b) represented by 0 and 1, respectively. One of the two color values (block values) is assigned to each texel, thus compressing the texture map. Color is but one example given in the specification, and other characteristics may be determined in an equivalent fashion. As such, Claim 16 is not anticipated by *Powell* and allowable over the same. Claims 17-23 and 29-33 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for the same reasons as claim 16.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claims 24 and 35 for the same reasons as claim 16. Applicants traverse for the same reasons as discussed in claim 16. Additionally, claims 36-53 depend from claim 35 and are not anticipated for the same reason. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants would like the Examiner to more fully explain his rejection with regards to independent claims 24 and 35.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. New claim 54 is presented which incorporates the allowable limitations of claim 18 with claim 16.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments to the claims and the above remarks, Applicants believe that the objections and rejections in the Office Action of September 17, 2003 are fully overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrew Wolfe

Date: 12/24/03

By: 

Susan Yee, Reg. No. 41,388
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3423
Fax: (650) 812-3444